EXHIBIT D

TO RULE 4.2 STATEMENT OF DR. DOUGHERTY

JOINT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION WORKSHEET[1]
U.S. Patent No. 6,816,356
Case No. 3:07-CV-0893 (IEG) (NLS) *Presidio Components, Inc. v. American Technical Ceramics Corp.*

CLAIM (claim terms in **bold** are disputed)	AGREED PROPOSED CONSTR.	PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION	DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION	COURT'S CONSTRUCTION
1. A capacitor comprising:				
a substantially monolithic dielectric body;		A largely, but not necessarily wholly, one-piece dielectric body.[2]	A dielectric body largely but not wholly without seams from the inclusion of conductive plates within the dielectric body.[3]	

[1] The asserted claims 2, 4, 5, and 16 are not included in the Worksheet because the parties are not seeking their construction at this time.

[2] Presidio objects to any consideration of the issue of indefiniteness or of the referenced "Statement of Dr. Dougherty," for at least the following reasons. First, ATC's arguments relating to any purported indefiniteness of certain claims are premature and are not properly the subject of this Joint Claim Construction Worksheet. As demonstrated by Presidio in the Joint Claim Construction Chart, Worksheet and Hearing Statement, this is not the proper forum for ATC to raise this issue. Second, Presidio disagrees with ATC, and submits that the case relied upon by ATC (*Halliburton*) does not stand for the proposition for which ATC cites it. Third, even as ATC provided to Presidio its comments to this document, ATC had not provided Presidio with the "Statement of Dr. Dougherty." Presidio submits to the Court that ATC has thereby violated Patent Local Rules 4.1(b) and 4.1(d), which require "[w]ith respect to any such witnesses, percipient or expert, the parties must also provide a brief description of the substance of that witness's proposed testimony."

[3] ATC respectfully requests that, as part of the claim construction process, the Court consider whether this claim element is capable of construction due to its indefiniteness as fully presented in the Rule 4.2 Statement of Dr. Dougherty attached as Exhibit 4.

CLAIM (claim terms in **bold** are disputed)	AGREED PROPOSED CONSTR.	PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION	DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION	COURT'S CONSTRUCTION
a conductive first plate disposed within the dielectric body;			No construction required *per se*.	
a conductive second plate disposed within the dielectric body and forming a capacitor with the first plate;			No construction required *per se*.	
a conductive first contact disposed externally on the dielectric body and electrically connected to the first plate; and		A conductive material arranged on an external surface portion of the substantially monolithic dielectric body having an electrical connection with the first plate.	A conductive layer for attaching the capacitor (recited in the preamble) to an external conductor, the conductive layer being present on an external surface portion of the substantially monolithic dielectric body and touching the conductive first plate to establish electrical connection.	

CLAIM (claim terms in **bold** are disputed)	AGREED PROPOSED CONSTR.	PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION	DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION	COURT'S CONSTRUCTION
a conductive second contact disposed externally on the dielectric body and electrically connected to the second plate, and		A conductive material arranged on an external surface portion of the substantially monolithic dielectric body having an electrical connection with the second plate.	A conductive layer for attaching the capacitor (recited in the preamble) to another external conductor, the conductive layer being present on an electrically separate external surface portion of the substantially monolithic dielectric body and touching the conductive second plate to establish electrical connection.	
the second contact being located sufficiently close to the first contact to form a first fringe-effect		Forming a capacitance between or proximate opposed ends of the first and second conductive contacts which affects the high frequency	An end of the first conductive contact and an end of the second conductive contact are positioned in an edge-to-edge relationship in such proximity as to form a determinable	

CLAIM (claim terms in **bold** are disputed)	AGREED PROPOSED CONSTR.	PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION	DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION	COURT'S CONSTRUCTION
capacitance with the first contact.		performance of the capacitor as a whole.[4]	capacitance.[5]	
3. The capacitor of claim 1 wherein **the first fringe-effect capacitance is disposed on a first side of the dielectric body** and the first contact and the second contact are further disposed on a second side of the dielectric body, and			ATC respectfully requests that, as part of the claim construction process, the Court consider whether this claim element is capable of construction due to its indefiniteness as fully presented in the Rule 4.2 Statement of Dr. Dougherty attached as Exhibit 4.	

[4] As noted above in footnote 2, Presidio submits that ATC's request for the Court to consider indefiniteness or the Statement of Dr. Dougherty at this juncture is improper for multiple reasons.

[5] ATC respectfully requests that, as part of the claim construction process, the Court consider whether this claim element is capable of construction due to its indefiniteness as fully presented in the Rule 4.2 Statement of Dr. Dougherty attached as Exhibit 4.

CLAIM (claim terms in **bold** are disputed)	AGREED PROPOSED CONSTR.	PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION	DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION	COURT'S CONSTRUCTION
the second contact being located sufficiently close to the first contact on the second side of the dielectric body to form a second fringe-effect capacitance with the first contact.		Forming a capacitance between or proximate opposed ends of the first and second conductive contacts on a second side of the substantially monolithic dielectric body which affects the high frequency performance of the capacitor as a whole.[6]	Another end of the first conductive contact and another end of the second conductive contact are present on the second side of the substantially monolithic dielectric body and are positioned in an edge-to-edge relationship in such proximity as to form a determinable capacitance.[7]	

[6] As noted above in footnote 2, Presidio submits that ATC's request for the Court to consider indefiniteness or the Statement of Dr. Dougherty at this juncture is improper for multiple reasons.

[7] ATC respectfully requests that, as part of the claim construction process, the Court consider whether this claim element is capable of construction due to its indefiniteness as fully presented in the Rule 4.2 Statement of Dr. Dougherty attached as Exhibit 4.

CLAIM (claim terms in **bold** are disputed)	AGREED PROPOSED CONSTR.	PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION	DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION	COURT'S CONSTRUCTION
18. The capacitor of claim 1 wherein **the ceramic body** comprises a plurality of ceramic tape layers laminated together in a green ceramic state and fired to form **a cured monolithic ceramic structure.**			ATC respectfully requests that, as part of the claim construction process, the Court consider whether these claim elements are capable of construction due to their indefiniteness as fully presented in the Rule 4.2 Statement of Dr. Dougherty attached as Exhibit 4.	
19. The capacitor of claim 1 wherein **the dielectric body has a hexahedron shape**,		The dielectric body has six major surfaces.[8]	The substantially monolithic dielectric body has six sides.[9]	

[8] As noted above in footnote 2, Presidio submits that ATC's request for the Court to consider indefiniteness or the Statement of Dr. Dougherty at this juncture is improper for multiple reasons.

CLAIM (claim terms in **bold** are disputed)	AGREED PROPOSED CONSTR.	PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION	DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION	COURT'S CONSTRUCTION
the first and second external conductive contacts being positioned on opposed end surfaces of the hexahedron shape.				

[9] ATC respectfully requests that, as part of the claim construction process, the Court consider whether this claim element is capable of construction due to its indefiniteness as fully presented in the Rule 4.2 Statement of Dr. Dougherty attached as Exhibit 4.